MONEGAW CREEK TMDL
SUMMARY OF COMMENTS AND RESPONSES
Prepared by the Environmental Protection Agency, Region 7
Water, Wetlands, and Pesticides Division
August, 2006

COMMENTOR(S):

- David Cavender, 1507 East Price Street, Springfield, Missouri 65804 (via email)
- Anne Peery, Missouri Department of Natural Resources, Water Protection Program, Jefferson Building, 13th Floor, Jefferson City, Missouri 65102 (via email)

INTRODUCTION

This document summarizes the submitted comment(s), identifies the commenter(s), responds to the comment(s), and summarizes change(s) made to the final TMDL. They are arranged by TMDL section wherever possible. Any change that is made to the TMDL in response to comment(s) is summarized in the response. If no change is noted in the response, then no change was needed in the TMDL.

COMMENTS AND RESPONSES

GENERAL COMMENTS

Comment 1: David Cavender writes that there is a lack of data on aquatic life in Monegaw Creek and that biological data is needed to determine if the stream should remain on the Missouri list of impaired waters.
Response: This comment is beyond the scope of the TMDL public notice which does not deal with the listing methodology for sulfate in Missouri. Monegaw Creek was judged to be impaired based on numeric criteria for sulfate which the TMDL utilizes to analyze and address the impaired waterbody.

SECTION 1: INTRODUCTION

No Comments

SECTION 2: BACKGROUND AND WATER QUALITY PROBLEMS

Comment 1: David Cavender requests clarification concerning two sentences on page three of the TMDL where reference to exceedence of Water Quality Standards (WQS) is made.
Response: As to whether or not the stream exceeds Missouri WQS, the TMDL states that data collected between 2000-2003 shows that Monegaw did not exceed WQS at that time, while more recent data from 2004-2006 shows that there are still three miles of highly mineralized waters that still exceeds the state standard of sulfate.

Comment 2: Anne Peery suggests better wording and corrects a reference to Monegaw's confluence with it's main stem of the Osage River, not the Osceola River.
Response: The TMDL has been updated using her comments making the TMDL more readable and accurate.

SECTION 3: DESCRIPTION OF THE APPLICABLE WQS AND NUMERIC WATER QUALITY TARGETS
No Comments

SECTION 4: CALCULATION OF LOAD CAPACITY
No Comments

SECTION 5: LOAD ALLOCATION (NONPOINT SOURCE LOADS)
No Comments

SECTION 6: MARGIN OF SAFETY
No Comments

SECTION 7: SEASONAL VARIATION
No Comments

SECTION 8: MONITORING PLANS FOR HONEY CREEK
No Comments

SECTION 9: PUBLIC PARTICIPATION
No Comments

SECTION 10: APPENDICES
No Comments